

REMARKS

Claims 28-48 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action dated June 29, 2007, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Rejected claims 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, 40, 42, 43, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore, et al. (U.S. 6,875,102)*("Bickmore").
- B.) Rejected claims 30-32, 37-39, and 44-46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore* in view of *Smith, et al. (U.S. 5,212,770)*("Smith").
- C.) Rejected claims 34, 41, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore* in view of *Kursh (U.S. 2001/0032076)*.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below.

- A.) Rejection of claims 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, 40, 42, 43, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore, et al. (U.S. 6,875,102)*("Bickmore"):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 28, 35, and 42 have each been amended to clarify that the style information, which includes a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery, is read from a word processing document. In other words, the word processing document includes the style information. Applicants submit the amended claim language merely clarifies the claim language by reciting the word processing document includes the paragraph style gallery and text style gallery. Accordingly, Applicants submit that a further search on this subject matter should not be necessary, as the claim has merely been amended to clarify the claim language.

Claims 28, 25, and 42, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to converting a word processing document to a compact word processing document format. Style information

is read from the word processing document. The read style information includes a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery, and is stored in a first record. Text is read from the word processing document. The text and run information is stored in a second record. The run information describes locations in the text where the style information is to be applied.

This is clearly unlike *Bickmore*, which *Bickmore* fails to disclose or suggest reading a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery from a word processing document. The Examiner correctly explains that *Bickmore*'s Index Segment transform analyzes a document and partitions the document into paragraphs. *Office Action of 6/29/07*, page 6. Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, nowhere does *Bickmore* teach or suggest reading a paragraph style gallery or text style gallery from a document. Instead, *Bickmore* analyzes a document's text to determine where the paragraph breaks are. This is clearly unrelated to reading a paragraph style gallery that is in a document. In fact, nowhere does *Bickmore* suggest that a document may include a paragraph style gallery and text style gallery.

For at least these reasons, *Bickmore* fails to disclose or suggest claims 28, 35, and 42.

Claims 29, 33, 36, 40, 43, and 47 depend directly or indirectly from claims 28, 35, or 42 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejection of claims 30-32, 37-39, and 44-46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore* in view of *Smith, et al. (U.S. 5,212,770)*(“*Smith*”):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable over *Bickmore* as discussed above.

Smith still fails to disclose or suggest reading a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery from a word processing document. Therefore, *Bickmore* in view of *Smith* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 28, 35, and 42.

Claims 30-32, 37-39, and 44-46 depend directly or indirectly from claims 28, 35, or 42 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 34, 41, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore* in view of *Kursh (U.S. 2001/0032076)*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable over *Bickmore* as discussed above.

Kursh still fails to disclose or suggest reading a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery from a word processing document. Therefore, *Bickmore* in view of *Kursh* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 28, 35, and 42.

Claims 34, 41, and 48 depend directly or indirectly from claims 28, 35, or 42 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher P. Rauch/
Christopher P. Rauch
Reg. No. 45,034

Customer Number: 58328
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Phone: (312) 876-8000
Fax: (312) 876-7934